

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed January 27, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morishita (5,127,380) in view of Agarrat (5,465,694); and rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakatani et al. (4,957,079) (hereinafter “Nakatani”). These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

As for claims 1-4 and 6, Applicant has canceled them, which renders the rejection moot now. With respect to the rejection of claims 5 as being anticipated by Nakatani, this rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons. First of all, Applicant has amended claim 5 to recite “wherein said camshaft thrust cam cap is mounted over a bearing surface configured to carry the camshaft; and said camshaft thrust cam cap forms a bearing part that protrudes with respect to a width of the bearing surface to support longitudinal movement of the camshaft at a lateral side of said camshaft thrust cam cap.” Applicant has also amended claim 5 by reciting “said body member” instead of “said body part” in line 6 of the claim to correct antecedent basis issues. Second, Nakatani fails to disclose a camshaft thrust cam cap as the one in claim 5.

Nakatani teaches a thrust restrictive structure (item 16, FIG. 3) that comprises a thrust collar (item 14, FIG. 3) and a plain, split thrust bearing (item 13, FIG. 3) (see also col. 5, lines 40-44). The thrust collar is integrally formed with the exhaust camshaft (item 3) (col. 5, lines 40-44). The plain, split thrust bearing is formed with an inner annular groove (item 15), which receives the thrust collar (col. 5, lines 40-44).

In comparison, the thrust restrictive structure in Nakatani does not have a “camshaft thrust cam cap is mounted over a bearing surface configured to carry the camshaft.” Assuming *arguendo* that the thrust collar could be called a bearing surface, then it does not provide a bearing surface configured to carry the camshaft because it only serves to “orient the oil passage substantially perpendicularly to a plane” (col. 6, lines 4-13), such that the radial oil passage (item 20) does not become parallel with the fitting surface (item 21) of the plain, split thrust bearing during maximum thrust (col. 6, lines 29-32).

Nakatani also does not teach a “bearing part that protrudes with respect to a width of the bearing surface to support longitudinal movement of the camshaft at a lateral side of said camshaft thrust cam cap.” Assuming *arguendo*, that the bearing cap (item 13a) of the split thrust bearing 13 could be read as such a bearing part, it does not support longitudinal movement of the camshaft at a lateral side of the thrust cam shaft. According to Nakatani, the exhaust overhead camshaft is supported by the cylinder head (item 1) (col. 5, lines 52-58), which is not the bearing cap of Nakatani and certainly not the bearing part of claim 5.

In light of the foregoing, Nakatani does not anticipate claim 5. Because claim 6 depends on claim 5, Nakatani also does not anticipate it. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 6.


**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, it is believed that the application as a whole is in form for allowance. Should the Examiner have any continuing objections, the Examiner is respectfully asked to contact the undersigned at 415-442-1000 in order to expedite allowance of the case. Authorization is granted to charge any outstanding fees due at this time for the continued prosecution of this matter to Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP Deposit Account No. 50-0310 (matter no. 060945-0111).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 27, 2005

By:

  
Nancy I. Sya 52,266  
For Thomas D. Kohler Reg. No.  
**Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP** 32,797  
2 Palo Alto Square, Suite 700  
3000 El Camino Real  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
(415) 442-1106